Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 3 - 9 are pending. No amendments have been made to these claims in this response.

Rejection of claims 1, 3 - 8 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0098840, hereinafter Hanson)

Applicants maintain that for at least the reasons discussed in Applicants' response of February 22, 2011, claim 1 is not anticipated by Hanson.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner appears to argue that the establishment of the session between the MES and the MMS server, as taught by Hanson, corresponds to the functionality of trust relationships, and thus, teaches the recited limitations involving trust relationships in the pending claims. Applicants submit that the Examiner misapplies the teaching of Hanson in this regard.

For at least the reasons discussed in Applicants' response of February 22, 2011, Applicants submit that the recited trust relationships between devices that belong to a community of networked devices according to the present claims is distinguishable from the establishment of a session between an MES and an MMS server as taught by Hanson.

In this regard, Applicants note that the Examiner has wholly failed to address Applicants' point that the system of Hanson is a centralized one that is centralized around the MMS server. Due to this centralization, a device is connected to the "same network" even if the device is moving. Hanson fails to address multi-site domestic, not connected to an external network.

By contrast, the present invention relates to a community of networked devices where no central device is required due to the information stored in the devices and to the synchronization between them, i.e., to the exchange of information about trusted and distrusted devices. An advantage of the present invention is that it facilitates communications between devices in a multi-site

domestic network both by reducing the need for the user of certifying relationships between devices and by having the possibility of moving with a part of the network community, i.e., split the network in 2 sites. The synchronization of trust synchronization, according to the present invention, allows the establishing of trust relationship through the community of networked devices without any user intervention or access to a central device, as required by Hanson.

Due to these differences, Hanson fails to disclose or suggest, inter alia, the feature of "means for trust relationships synchronization with each device belonging to said community of network devices based on the stored information."

In view of the above, Applicants maintain that the pending claims are not anticipated by Hanson.

Rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson as applied to claim 6, in view of Fraser et al (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0131232).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since Fraser is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Hanson explained above in conjunction with claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that there are no additional fees due with regard to the filing of this response. However if there is an additional fee due, please charge the fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
NICHOLAS PRIGENT ET AL.

By: /Paul P. Kiel/
Paul P. Kiel, Attorney
Reg. No. 40,677
Phone (609) 734-6815

Date: 6/22/11

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312